

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1–29 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended. Claims 1–29 remain pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under § 102

Claims 1–29 were rejected as obvious over *Premiere 6.5 for Windows and Macintosh: Visual Quickstart Guide* by Antony Bolante (“Bolante”) in view of *Pro Tools Reference Guide* published by Digidesign (“Digidesign”). Copies of excerpts from the Bolante reference were provided with both the first Office Action in this case, mailed January 10, 2007, and the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007. In each case, the page numbers for this reference refer to handwritten numbers on the copies provided that were added by Examiner. The Digidesign reference includes conventional page numbers.

Claims 1–29 are directed to methods, GUIs, and computer readable media that relate to the editing of media files. The following remarks address independent claim 1. However, each independent claim includes similar limitations and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. Similarly, the dependent claims each incorporate such limitations from the corresponding independent claim and are therefore also allowable.

Claim 1 describes a method for editing a media file that includes one or more media segments. Claim 1 recites changing the length of a media segment by grabbing and moving an endpoint of the segment. The grabbing and moving come from user interface signals relating to cursor position over a timeline. Claim 1 further requires “receiving from a user interface an interface mode selection, wherein in a first interface mode time shifting of media segments is provided in connection with changing the length of the media segment and wherein in a second interface mode time shifting of media segments is not provided in connection with changing the length of the media segment.” This limitation is supported at least by Paragraph [0024] of the application.

Neither Bolante nor Digidesign teach or suggest this limitation. For example, Bolante describes the trimming operation on pp. 24–25. This passage does not disclose whether clips other than the one being trimmed are time shifted or not, and this passage certainly does not

describe “receiving from a user interface an interface mode selection...” to select whether clips are time shifted or not. Similarly, the single page of Digidesign provided is also silent as to whether clips are time shifted or not and contains no teaching or selection of “receiving from a user interface an interface mode selection...” as recited in the independent claims.

Conclusion

Because the limitation of each independent claim requiring “receiving from a user interface an interface mode selection, wherein in a first interface mode time shifting of media segments is provided in connection with changing the length of the media segment and wherein in a second interface mode time shifting of media segments is not provided in connection with changing the length of the media segment” is not met by art of record, the rejection of these claims is improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

January 14, 2008

Date

/Billy C. Allen III/

Billy C. Allen III

Reg. No. 46,147

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,

RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.

20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600

Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400

832/446-2424 (facsimile)

wcpatent@counselip.com